DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 835 FL 014 187

AUTHOR Met, Myriam
TITLE Immersion and the Language Minority Student. Revised Version.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Milwaukee. Midwest National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center.
PUB DATE Jan 84
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; Educational Needs; *English (Second Language); *Immersion Programs; *Immigrants; Language of Instruction; *Limited English Speaking; Minority Group Children; Program Design; *Program Effectiveness; *Second Language Instruction

ABSTRACT

There are over 3 million children in the United States whose primary language is other than English. Although bilingual education has been effective in meeting their needs, its availability is limited, and the alternative is often limited or no English instruction at all. It is not yet clear how effective total immersion is for non-English speakers by comparison with immersion for English- dominant students. Differences between the groups will affect program effectiveness. Immersion programs, like bilingual programs, use teachers familiar with the students' native language and include instruction in it, and this aspect may make it as difficult to implement immersion programs as to implement bilingual programs. However, immersion as an instructional strategy can be incorporated into existing programs in which language minority students are exposed to content area instruction in English. Some effective components of programs for language minority students are complementary native language instruction, frequent positive interaction with English speakers, opportunities for comfortable native language conversation during the school day to alleviate stress and promote language pride, rewards for successful communication, limited pressure for linguistic accuracy, and consideration of group cultural and linguistic differences in program design. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED240835

IMMERSION and the LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENT

Prepared by

Myriam Met
Cincinnati Public Schools

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ricardo R. Fernandez

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL014187

Midwest National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN–MILWAUKEE
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201 Phone: (414) 963-8663

IMMERSION

and

THE LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENT

Prepared by

Myriam Met
Cincinnati Public Schools

for the

Midwest National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
P.O. Box 413
Enderis Hall 523
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

January 1984
Revised Version

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Midwest National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center wishes to acknowledge with appreciation the review and comments provided by Dr. James Cummins of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education which have been incorporated into this document.

PREFACE

Language minority students in America's schools face a formidable challenge: they must master a complex array of skills in reading, mathematics, the sciences and the arts and become proficient in English. For most students, mastery of English and mastery of curricular objectives cannot be achieved simultaneously without intervention strategies. Bilingual education has been shown to be an extremely effective intervention strategy.

In bilingual education, students receive instruction in the curricular areas in their native language as well as English as a Second Language instruction. Thus, while the slow process of acquiring English language proficiency takes place, students are enabled to make progress in mastering the curricular objectives.

Bilingual education also integrates the students' home culture into the school curriculum. Thus the child's home language, values, attitudes and beliefs are supported in the school environment. The resultant positive effects on student's self-esteem make considerable contribution totheir academic progress and success in school. Bilingual education is therefore an effective and highly desirable approach to meeting the educational needs of students who are limited English proficiency (LEP).

Occasionally it is not possible or feasible to provide bilingual programs for language minority students. Scarcity of resources--trained personnel, textual materials, minimal number of students to be served combined with ethnolinguistic diversity--have caused educators to turn to the exploration of alternatives to providing quality and equality in education for the LEP students.

As immersion becomes a more frequently discussed form of second language education it is important that educators be clear about what immersion is (or is not). The purpose of this paper is to define immersion as both a program model and as an instructional technique, as well as to discuss those variables which must be considered when attempting to extend immersion from the education of Englisn speaking students to that of language minority students.

Immersion may or may not prove to be an effective efficient program model for minority children. Needless to say, careful documentation of progress of students in such a model would be required for its validation as a viable instructional program.

IMMERSION

and

THE LANGUAGE MINORITY STUDENT

In the past decade the immersion approach has reported impressive success in helping majority language children to become fluent in a second language. Study after study of program after program has shown similar results: when children are immersed in a school environment where the major medium of communication and instruction is in a language other than that spoken at home, students do become efficient users of their new language. Moreover, they achieve oral fluency in this language within a relatively brief period of time, (usually 2-3 years) even when there is little opportunity to hear or use the language outside the classroom. Perhaps more noteworthy is that despite the fact that subjects are taught in the school language, students are soon achieving at the same levels, and often beyond those of their peers in regular programs.

Based on the startling successes of immersion programs, and motivated by a desire to find efficient and cost effective means of assisting linguistically different children become proficient in English, some educators are looking at the immersion model as a means to develop English As A Second Language skills in national origin minority students. This paper will discuss the characteristics of immersion programs, particularly those which would impact such a program for limited English proficiency students, to ascertain the viability of immersion as a means of

developing English proficiency in language minority students.

IMMERSION, SUBMERSION AND SECOND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION: SOME DEFINITIONS.

This section discusses three types of approaches as means of teaching English to linguistically different students: immersion, submersion, and English As A Second Language classes.

Immersion programs for language majority children are a form of bilingual edcation in which school subjects are taught through the medium of a second language. In total immersion programs, all school instruction takes place in the second language in the early grades. Beginning in grade two or three, native language literacy skills are introduced, and time spent in native language subject matter instruction gradually increases to as much as 50% of the school day. In partial immersion programs part of the day (usually about 50%) is devoted to subject matter instruction in the second language, with the remainder taught through the medium of the native language.

In immersion, then, school subjects are taught through the second language. The focus is on subject matter, not on teaching language. Immersion as a method of teaching languages is not a novel concept: private schools for the elite in Europe and elsewhere have offered school programs taught in two languages for centuries. Immersion has more recently achieved acclaim primarily due to the commitment and meticulous research of Lambert and Tucker in Canada, and programs based on their model.[1]

Following the pattern set by the St. Lambert experiment,

schools in San Diego, Culver City, Milwaukee, Maryland, and New York have implemented total immersion progams for English speakers with results similar to those of the St. Lambert project: students become both proficient in their second language and achieve at or beyond expectations in their academic subjects.

Submersion differs from immersion in one major respect: students are "submersed" in classes where a large number of students are native speakers of the second language. Submersion techniques have been used with limited English proficiency students from time immemorial. In this sink or swim method, a few students survived and prospered. Others - too many - fell by the wayside, falling hopelessly farther and farther behind until they finally dropped out or were pushed out.

Unlike immersion and submersion, most other second language teaching methodologies use the classroom to focus on specific language skills. In second language teaching, the curriculum consists of a sequenced and structured hierarchy of linguistic, paralinguistic, and cultural skills to be mastered. Class sessions are often - but not always - in the second/foreign language. In contrast, in immersion/submersion, the curriculum is the regular academic curriculum; teaching the language is not an end in itself during the time students are "immersed"; the medium of instruction is always the second/foreign language; and the students' home language is never used. In sum, while a good second/foreign language teaching methodology often incorporates many immersion techniques, it is the focus of the curriculum and classroom activities that distinguish immersion/submersion from

second/foreign language teaching methods.

Both immersion and second language programs can point with pride to their successes. However, there have also been failures due to a number of factors, i.e., inadequate funding, poor scheduling of teachers, and a lack of appropriately trained teachers, to name some of the most salient. Immersion programs have been noteworthy for their striking successes in teaching English dominant children both academic and second language skills in an extremely cost effective manner. For these reasons, educators are increasingly looking toward immersion as a means of meeting the English language and academic needs of language minority students. Moreover, substantial differences in instructional and affective variables, and differences and in the target populations, also, impact the effectiveness of the total immersion method when utilized with students whose English proficiency is limited. These variables will be discussed in greater detail below.

WHY IMMERSION WORKS: LINGUISTIC VARIABLES.

Researchers and theoreticians believe immersion works for a variety of reasons. Linguistic variables are among the most prominent, and Krashen's Input Hypothesis neatly accounts for the success of immersion programs in providing language majority students with second language proficiency.[2]

The Input Hypothesis states that language is acquired when the learner understands what he hears. The more he understands--the more comprehensible the input--the more language is acquired. Oral proficiency results from acquisition: as receptive control of the language's structure and vocabulary

receptive control of the language's structure and vocabulary increases, the learner's ability to use structures and vocabulary increases as well.

The Input Hypothesis, and its basic premise that language is acquired through comprehensible input, accounts for both first and second language acquisition. Indeed, the similarities between first language acquisition and immersion techniques (and their results)are striking. The similarities provide important insights into factors which promote language growth.

What makes input comprehensible? That is, what kinds of language experiences help us to understand what we hear, and to use that understanding to expand our language skills? Researchers of child language acquistion have noted that "caretaker speech"-the language adults use with young children--is significantly different from adult-adult speech. Caretaker speech is geared down--it is slower than normal; it is adjusted to the assumed level of the child's linguistic and conceptual capability; it talks about the concrete, the here-and-now. These characteristics clearly help children understand what is said to them. It is through understanding, by matching what is heard with what is experienced, that the child is enabled to not only understand the world around him, but to talk about it as well.

Good immersion teachers use caretaker speech with their students. They speak clearly and distinctly. They avoid syntactic complexities and sophisticated lexicon. Most importantly, they match what they say with concrete, visual

referents. Students hear their new language within the context of clearly defined classroom experiences. When the kindergarten teacher says, "Take your blue crayon and draw a big circle on your paper,"while demonstrating simultaneously, his students are receiving comprehensible input. When the third grade science teacher conducts a classroom experiment with magnets, while carefully identifying the materials used and describing the process, her students are both acquiring new concepts and the language to discuss them simultaneously. These descriptions of classroom immersion techniques exemplify another similarity between caretaker speech and immersion. In both, the focus is on the experience, not on language. Mothers are concerned with the activities of daily life, (Let's get your shoes on. Yes, that's a doggie). Very little explicit attention is paid to vocabulary development or to expanding the child's syntactic repertoire. Vocabulary is taught only as a means of expanding the child's understanding of his world. Similarly, in immersion classrooms, little deliberate attempt to teach the target language (L_2) is made. Rather, language emerges as a by-product of instructional experiences related to the curriculum for that grade level. Thus, third-graders learn the word for magnet because it is part of their science curriculum, not because the language text says so.

In both native language (L_1) acquisition and in immersion, speech emerges. Neither children nor students are required to speak in complete, grammatically accurate sentences. Moreover, efforts at communication are both instrinsically and extrinsically rewarded. Instrinsic rewards come when the

child/learner knows he has been understood and the communication cycle is maintained (mother gives baby the cookie; the student's question is answered). Extrinsic rewards are found in the frequent positive reinforcement mothers and teachers give for language growth, such as praise and smiles. These rewards, both instrinsic and extrinsic, are for successful efforts to communicate, and rarely for grammatical accuracy. This is in sharp contrast to the traditional second language classroom, where rewards for accuracy are given more often than for attempts at communication.

Comprehensible input is available to immersion students not only because teachers use caretaker speech, but also because what is taught, and how it is taught, is carefully geared to students' ability to comprehend. Immersion teachers rely heavily on concrete experiences, manipulative materials, visual aids, realia, and other such strategies to maximize opportunities for students to recognize the relationship between what they hear and the meaning of what is heard. Subjects such as physical education, directed handwork and other art activities, mathematics and science (especially in the primary grades), are ideal subjects for immersion because they are so highly experiential and rely little on verbal abstractions and interactions. In the intermediate grades, as students progress through the curriculum, their growing language skills enable them to deal with the increasing abstraction of the subject matter.

Immersion programs also include an L_1 component. The amount of native language instruction varies anywhere from 10% to

50% of the school day in year one, gradually increasing to as high as 50% of the school day. The purpose of L_1 instruction is to maintain and strengthen the student's ability to read, write and otherwise perform academic tasks in both the home and school language. In many immersion programs, the L_1 component is often used to present the basis for difficult concepts soon to be taught in the L_2. This preparation in L_1 provides advance organizers for the lesson taught in L_2, thereby making the input of the L_2 lesson more comprehensible. In the respect that immersion programs include a native language component, immersion is a form of bilingual education.

In immersion classes, teachers speak the L_2 exclusively, but they are almost always proficient in the students' L_1. In the early stages, immersion students more often speak the L_1 to the teacher, who responds in the L_2. It is important to note that the teacher's ability to comprehend the students' L_1, and to respond appropriately, maximizes the value of communicative interactions, and thus, increases the amount of comprehensible input students receive. (Example: St.:[L_1] I can't find my book. T.:[L_2](pointing) It's under your chair). The more comprehensible input students receive, the more rapid and qualitative the acquisition of L_2 will be.

IMMERSION vs. SUBMERSION.

It would seem on the surface that submersion should work for the same reasons that immersion does. Closer examination reveals that the primary factor for successful L_2 acquistion--comprehensible input--is diminished, if not

almost non-existent, in submersion.

Immersion classes for majority language students are nomogeneous with respect to students' L_1. In submersion, the language of the classroom is the home language of most students. For the minority student, the majority language (English) is his L_2. Teachers, therefore, tend to use language geared to the linguistic capability of the majority. This language bears little resemblance to the caretaker speech of immersion teachers described earlier. Further, since it is assumed that the majority of students comprehend the language well, reliance on concrete experiences, manipulatives,visuals, etc., may be reduced. In sum, the language of classroom instruction and communication, and the experiences provided students, minimize opportunities for minority students to receive comprehensible input. Without such input, growth in L_2 is seriously retarded, which in turn impedes the youngster from meaningfully participating in the academic program and from making academic progress.

WHY IMMERSION WORKS: AFFECTIVE VARIABLES.

Learning is affected by the attitudes, expectations, values and feelings of students, parents and teachers. These affective variables play an instrumental role in the second language classroom.

Majority language students in immersion classes are highly motivated to learn the L_2. There is an excitement about being able to speak another language. The attitudes of parents and society reinforce this motivation: it is prestigious to know

more than one language (if your primary language is English) and proficiency in another language is considered a mark of an educated person. Students in immersion classes are there because their parents have selected that program for their children as a special option, as an opportunity to add that special "extra" to their children's education. Second language opportunities are thus viewed as enriching the child's educational experience ("additive").

In immersion programs for majority language students, parents and society do not view bilingualism as negative, as a threat to the status of the home language and culture. There is little concern that study of Spanish by Anglo children in California, or of French by English speakers in Maryland, will diminish the value or role of English in the student's life. Nor is there fear that appreciation of Hispanic or Francophone culture, attitudes and beliefs will result in conflict with the dominant American values, attitudes and beliefs the student has acquired in his home.

Thus, the immersion student approaches the second language experience with positive anticipation.[3] Parents, teachers and society at large encourage the student to succeed. Immersion staff are usually carefully selected, well trained and highly motivated. Their positive attitudes toward the program and its goals are influential in students' perceptions. Growth in the student's language proficiency is accompanied by praise--parents are pleased, relatives are impressed, and society highlights the benefits that will accrue the student who demonstrates sufficient

second language proficiency to expand employability in the job market. Not only are such positive expectations reinforced outside the classroom, but inside as well, since peers in the class tend to share the same positive attitudes toward the second language and to the instructional setting.

The positive expectations the student brings to the immersion class are enhanced by several factors within the instructional environment. As noted earlier, immersion teachers understand the student's home language and in the early stages, students often use the L_1 to communicate. Frustration and anxiety are reduced when the student can and may freely communicate his needs and desires. Anxiety about ability to perform in the second language is also minimized since immersion does not focus on language, but on instructional experiences. Students are so engaged in comprehending the mathematical concept of regrouping, or in the geography lesson on map skills, that the fact that the lesson is being conducted in another language becomes secondary. Thus, ability to subtract 49 from 52 is more important than using the correct form of the verb. In contrast, the focus of attention in second/foreign language classrooms is performance in the language. When students must be concerned with their ability to perform, and to perform well, the anxiety level is increased; and, educational psychologists have long known that high levels of anxiety interfere with achievement.

Krashen's Input Hypothesis holds that the "affective filter" plays a crucial role in language acquisition.[4] When the filter is "up" input cannot penetrate easily and acquisition is reduced.

Conversely, when the filter is "down," comprehensible input is more easily absorbed and acquisition is enhanced. Clearly, in immersion programs the affective filter is down. Students bring positive attitudes and expectations to the instructional program that tend to lower the filter. Moreover, the nature of immersion instruction--with its focus off language and linguistic performance--helps to keep the filter down.

AFFECTIVE VARIABLES IN SUBMERSION AND ESL CLASSES.

The affective variables which contribute to the success of immersion programs for majority language students are also relevant to the performance of minority students under different instructional conditions.

Minority students come to school with conflicting perceptions of the value of their home language and culture within the larger culture, and thus may also harbor apprehension and negative attitudes toward learning English. Many students perceive that society holds their language and culture to be secondary in value and importance to English and the "American way of life." Parents are often anxious about the impact of American schooling on children's observance of traditional customs and values. While most teachers hold positive attitudes and expectations toward these students, there is a prevailing sense that special instructional services provided language minority children are compensatory in nature. In immersion, second language proficiency is perceived as an optional benefit of schooling, a nice something extra. For the language minority student, English proficiency is a necessity for economic,

political and social survival in mainstream America. The pressure to learn English--pressure in the form of societal demands, institutional and teacher expectations, and parental desires--is a clear, persistent and often anxiety-arousing variable in the student's school life.

In submersion, the contributions of the child's home life, language and culture may not always be recognized, since the majority of students are from mainstream American backgrounds. The minority student often feels isolated, out of place. The student's isolation is reinforced since he understands little of what is said, and he has little, if any, opportunity to freely communicate his needs and desires in his L_1. Submersion is a high anxiety setting for the minority student: the affective filter is up.

For similar reasons, the ESL classroom may also be perceived negatively. The conflicting emotions about his home language/culture vis-a-vis those of the majority that the student brings to the institution of schooling filter through to the ESL classroom. In addition to anxiety about the role of English in his life, the student must deal with the need to perform linguistically. Every moment in the ESL classroom may be one in which he is expected to demonstrate his ability to understand, speak, read or write English. Concerns about his ability to perform may diminish his ability to perform.

PUPIL CHARACTERISTICS: MAJORITY AND MINORITY LANGUAGE STUDENTS.

Characteristics of the pupil population influence the

success of any instructional program. Variables in the immersion population interact with the linguistic and affective variables previously discussed.

Ability to function in cognitive tasks in L_1 is hypothesized to be related to L_2 functioning.[5] Majority language students in immersion programs tend to have rather well developed first language skills. Outside the immersion classroom L_1 skills continue to be reinforced, continue to be expanded for cognitive related tasks, and continue to be necessary to the student for daily communication needs.

As a group, students in a given immersion class tend to be rather homogeneous: they tend to share the same home language and culture. The range of L_1 skills among the class members, while seemingly wide from one perspective, is actually rather narrow when compared with the diversity of L_1 skills to be found in a class of language minority children. The homogeneity of immersion majority language students extends beyond L_1 to L_2 skills.They tend to begin their L_2 study together. They tend to progress at relatively similar rates, although there is variation in rate of acquisition. Many immersion students have little contact with L_2 outside the school day.[6] L_2 input is therefore controlled and relatively uniform. Individual variations in rate or quality of acquisition reflect individual variations in ability to extract comprehensible input from the language source. The source itself however remains relatively constant.

Language minority children have greater opportunity for

exposure to English outside the school day. Movies and television are readily accessible and may provide a modified source of comprehensible input to the student. Opportunities for interactions with native speakers of English on the playground, in church, and in the marketplace may vary among students, as will the nature of such interactions. Increased opportunities to communicate meaningfully-- that is, to obtain comprehensible input and to perform successfully in English language interactions-- will clearly have a beneficial effect on English language proficiency. However, the variation in English language skills that minority students may demonstrate as a result of such interactions affect communicative ability in English. Often the temptation is to exit minority students from supportive programs once surface fluency has been achieved, ignoring the students' continued need to improve academic language skills. In contrast, language majority students tend to continue to have opportunities to devevelop L_2 skills in cognitively demanding tasks through longer participation in the program.

LEARNING THE LESSONS OF IMMERSION.

It should be clear from the previous discussion that a successful program of instruction for language minority students should be designed by applying the lessons we have learned from previous successes and failures of second language programs. A successful instructional program does three things: it provides opportunity for the acquisition of academic and English language skills, it considers the affective needs of pupils, and it considers individual population differences.

Language minority students need an instructional environment that promotes acquisition of academic skills and English. Immersion techniques may be used to teach subject matter in English to language minority students. To be effective, it is critical that such instruction be done in ways which maximize pupil comprehension. Extensive use of concrete experiences, manipulative materials and realia are required. Language register must be appropriate to the limited English skills of students. Teachers must focus on a variety of verbal and non-verbal feedback indicators to monitor pupils' comprehension. In sum subject matter instruction should be geared to the linguistic capability of the language minority student. It should constitute comprehensible input.

An extremely effective means of facilitating subject matter instruction in English is to complement that instruction with native language instruction. Just as immersion programs include an L_1 component, so too effective programs for minority students should include an L_1 component. The purpose of this component is manifold. It provides context and background for subject matter instruction in English, thus enhancing the student's ability to understand what is taught in English. If concepts are first taught in the students' native language then further development, reinforcement and enrichment of those concepts is facilitated when taught in L_2 because native language instruction provides context - a meaningful framework - for instruction given in L_2. Since instruction in L_1 makes L_2 instruction more comprehensible (i.e., comprehensible input), THE

NET RESULT IS THAT NATIVE LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION MAY CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVING THE STUDENTS' ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY. Native language instruction also helps the minority student maintain and grow in L_1 skills--with concomitant benefits to his growth in L_2. Lastly, students' attitudes toward the school, its language and culture are enhanced when their own language and culture are valued and integrated (rather than rejected and denigrated) in the curriculum. Such positive attitudes should make students receptive, rather than resistant, to learning English.

Language skills grow in an acquisition-rich environment. An acquisition rich environment is one in which the learner has ample opportunities to hear language used in meaningful contexts, and wherein the context makes language meaningful. Context makes language meaningful when the learner is able to deduce from experience, concrete examples and visual realia the meaning of what is heard. Meaningful language is language used for real communication--it should serve the function of receiving and sending messages, of sharing new information. Situations in which structures and patterns are drilled in rote fashion run counter to the proposition of meaningful communication. Comprehensible input, and communicative (functional) language use are crucial to language growth, and found in both immersion and traditonal second language programs.

Frequent opportunities for positive interaction with native speakers of English should be provided to language minority students both in and outside of the classroom setting. On the playground acquisition of English is promoted through

participation in activities in which what is said, and how it is said, are clearly related to the events to which they refer. Matching sound to meaning--understanding language--takes place readily in the course of highly contextualized activities such as kickball, hopscotch, tag, etc. Moreover, the focus is off learning language and on the process of the game itself, thereby lowering the affective filter. The high comprehensibility of playground language, coupled with strong motivational factors, are probably the reasons why children seem to learn language so well outside school settings.

Effective programs for language minority students acknowledge the critical role affective variables play in the learning process. Such programs provide opportunities for students to communicate with comfort and ease--i e., in their native language during the school day. Students' anxieties are minimized when students know they can make their pressing needs, desires, frustrations and questions understood. Native language instruction in subject matter contributes substantially to achieving this goal. Further, it ensures that students are not falling farther and farther behind academically while the slow process of learning English proceeds. Students who can take pride in their academic growth will manifest more positive attitudes toward school, and thus be more receptive to the instructional program. Good programs also instill a sense of pride in students in their home language and culture, recognizing that a positive self-image and security in one's ethnic identity will diminish the threat posed by the necessity to learn the

linguistic and cultural skills needed to participate in mainstream life.

Effective L_2 instruction minimizes anxiety about ability to perform. Such instruction allows students to speak when ready--i.e., allows speech to emerge--and does not place a high premium on linguistic accuracy. Good instruction rewards successful communication, and provides opportunities to use language in sheltered, structured environments (e.g., ESL classes) in activities which parallel the communicative situations the learner faces outside the language classroom. In essence, good language instruction lowers the affective filter and thereby promotes language acquisition.

Lastly, an effective instructional program recognizes that individual differences (and group differences) affect instructional design. Immersion works for English dominant students. The cultural and linguistic characteristics of such students, and the socio-political climate in which immersion programs take place, are substantially different from those of language minority students, and should make us cautious about tranferring program models intact from one group to the other. It should be noted that in the early stages of immersion programs for English dominant students, students may use their native language for communicating with one another and with the teacher. The teacher always understands the native language of the pupils, although he/she speaks the L_2 exclusively. Further, native language instruction is included in the instructional continuum, either right from the beginning (as in partial immersion) or

beginning in grade two or three. Such conditions may not be replicable in programs for language minority students from diverse ethnolinguistic backgrounds or when qualified teaching personnel are unavailable. Further, within the designation "language minority student" wide variation among individuals and cultural groups regarding L_1 and L_2 skills, motivation, attitude to mainstream America, and geographic and local setting may prevent us from formulating a unitary program model. Such variations are markedly clear when we compare a second or third generation Spanish speaking youngster in the southwest with a newly arrived Cambodian student in Louisville, Kentucky, and these variations must be considered when selecting program models for the population to be served.

CONCLUSION

There are over 3 million children in the U.S. whose home or primary language is other than English. Bilingual education has been shown to be an effective approach to meeting the needs of such students[7], but, unfortunately, bilingual education is available to only a small number of them. Too often, the alternatives to bilingual education are no program at all or programs that are limited in their effectiveness. The purpose of this paper has been to review immersion programs for language majority students in order to define such programs and to examine whether there are aspects of immersion which may be incorporated into instructional programs for language minority students when a bilingual education program cannot be offered.

Total immersion as a program model may or may not be as

effective for language minority students as it has been demonstrated to be with English dominant students. Real and substantial differences between these two groups will affect whether the program's results can be replicated. It should also be noted that immersion programs, like bilingual education programs, utilize teachers who understand the students' native language and that such programs include instruction in the students' native language. Therefore, the conditions which make it difficult or impossible to offer a program of bilingual education may prevent the implementation of an immersion program modeled after those for English speakers and may also impact its effectiveness. Nonetheless, immersion as an INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGY can be incorporated into existing programs in which language minority students are exposed to content area instruction in English.

As in most educational issues, there is no patent on "the best way" to assist students to achieve the instructional goals and objectives we have set for them. As educators we must be committed to continuing the search to explore new ways to enhance the quality of education for the pupils we serve.

REFERENCES

1. Barik, Henri and Swain, Merrill. "Three-Year Evaluation of a Large Scale Early Grade French Immersion Program: The Ottawa Study." Language Learning, 25 (1975), 1-30.

also

Lambert, W. E. and Tucker, G. R. The Bilingual Education of Children. Rowley, Massachusetts, Newbury House, 1972.

2. Krashen, Stephen, "The Input Hypothesis, in Alatis, James, ed. 1980 Georgetown Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1980.

3. For a discussion of the role of motivation in second language learning see, Gardner, R. C., and Lambert, W. E., "Motivational variables in Second Language Acquisition." Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13 (1959), 266-272.

4. Krashen uses Dulay and Burt's term "affective filter." See, Dulay, H. and Burt, M. "Remarks on Creativity in Language Acquisition." In Burt, M. et. al., eds., Viewpoints on English as a Second Language. New York: Regents, 1977.

5. Cummins, Jim, "The Entry and Exit Fallacy in Bilingual Education," NABE Journal. IV: 3 (Spring, 1980), pp. 25-59.

6. Swain, M., "Target Language Use in the Wider Environment as a Factor in its Acquisition," in Anderson, R. W., ed. New Dimension in Second Language Acquisition Research. Rowley, Massachusetts, Newbury House, 1981.

7. Troike, Rudolph C., "Research Evidence for the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education, Bilingual Education Paper Series; Volume 2, No. 5, Los Angeles, CA: National Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.

Cummins, James, "The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success for Language Minority Students, in Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework, Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, 1981.